

Meeting Notes

Evaluation of the MUN beneficial use in Agriculturally Dominated Water Bodies

June 3, 2015

9:00 AM

Location: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Office, 11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670: Training Room

Attendees:

California Urban Water Agencies – Elaine Archibald

California Farm Bureau Federation – Kari Fisher

Central Valley Clean Water Association – Debbie Webster

Central Valley Water Board –Anne Littlejohn, Cindy Au Yeung, Jeanne Chilcott, Pam Buford, Patrick Pulupa, True Khang

City of Colusa – Jesse Cain

City of Willows – Skylar Lipski

Nexgen Utility Management – Dan Rich, Melissa Lee

San Joaquin Tributary Authority – Dennis Westcot

Robertson-Bryan Inc. – Michael Bryan, Michelle Brown (*by phone*)

Sacramento River Joint Source Water Protection Program – Bonny Starr

San Joaquin Valley Drainage Authority – David Cory

Santa Clara Water District – Laura Young

Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District –Mike Nordstrom (*by phone*), Dennis Tristao (*by phone*)

Turlock Irrigation District – Debbie Liebersbach

Meeting Summary

Goal of meeting: Provide a project update and obtain stakeholder feedback on the development of the LIMITED-MUN beneficial use designation

Project Update

- Project Update: Central Valley Water Board Staff provided a brief update on the project including:
 - Approval of Sacramento MUN POTW Basin Plan Amendment by Regional Board in April 2015 and tentative State Board Hearing in August 2015.
 - Review of the Board Workshop on the MUN Process Amendment in April 2015
 - Board members asked for an update on the development of the new LIMITED-MUN beneficial category.
 - An informational item focused only on the proposed LIMITED-MUN beneficial use will be scheduled for the Regional Board meeting in July

Discussion on the development of the proposed LIMITED-MUN beneficial use designation

- Review of Flow Chart 1 Water Body Categorization
 - Definitions – Central Valley Water Board staff brought up the need to define “Ag drainage” for Flow Chart 1. For example, can drainage from Ag fields during the non-irrigation season or during rain storms be considered Ag drainage? Stakeholder comments were as follows:
 - Ag storm water drainage should be included when considering the type of flow in the Flow Chart 1 categorization process. Water quality after a storm due to run-off from an Ag field can be significantly impacted.
 - There should be coordination with the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program when working on this definition
 - Constructed Ag channels can be multi-use facilities and if they accept recycled water, effluent, and storm water, they should be considered in the C1 category.
 - Storm water and effluent are part of the exceptions listed in Exception 2a in the Sources of Drinking Water Policy.

- Exception 2b indicates that drainage should be the primary purpose of the construction or modification.
- Consideration also needs to be given to clearly defining “natural” and “non-natural” flows, with regard to perennial and non-perennial water bodies.

Action Items:

- *Central Valley Water Board staff will follow-up with the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program and further develop draft definitions for Flow Chart 1.*
- Categories proposed for LIMITED-MUN
 - Staff presented the water body categories proposed for a LIMITED-MUN designation (C2/M2/B1/B2)
 - No alternative designations were proposed.
- Proposed options for the LIMITED-MUN definition
 - Stakeholder comments regarding the goals for a LIMITED-MUN category included the following:
 - Maintain flexibility to use the water body for intended design/purpose
 - Needs distinction from full MUN use
 - Protect beneficial uses in downstream water bodies
 - Protect water body itself
 - Stakeholder comments regarding a definition included:
 - Should not include reference to water treatment – this is more of an implementation and or Drinking Water Division issue
 - Take the MUN definition from the Basin Plan and use it as a starting point
 - Define LIMITED-MUN as everything but potable water
 - Suggested wording – *Non-potable uses of water for community, military, or individual supply systems.*
 - Use of the “non-potable” term would eliminate association of the primary and secondary drinking water quality objectives.
 - Concern was expressed that the “non-potable” term is too broad and has no specific water quality objectives tied to it for source water.
- Proposed options for the LIMITED-MUN water quality objective

- Stakeholder comments regarding the water quality objectives included:
 - For non-potable uses, the terms “non-flammable” or “non-corrosive” could be used. However, there was concern that these terms are not protective enough.
 - Any reference to water treatment should be removed from the water quality objective.
 - Must define “impairing” or “impacting” if used in the objective to protect downstream beneficial uses.
 - Change narrative objective option 1 to *“Accumulation of constituents in the water body above natural background concentrations shall support the use of non-potable domestic supply (Limited MUN)”*.
 - Remove Antidegradation out of objective because it limits flexibility and be more restrictive.
 - Use of Antidegradation will require specific implementation guidance to reduce uncertainty.
 - Uncertainty in narrative objectives due to possibility of various interpretations.

Action Items:

- *Central Valley Water Board staff will review numeric objectives protective of non-potable water in other states.*
- *Central Valley Water Board staff will update LIMITED-MUN alternatives table and send it out to stakeholders for review. Comments due to Anne Littlejohn by June 22, 2015.*

Follow-up on other project discussion items

- Water body Listings – Level of Details
 - Staff provided draft language for providing MUN beneficial use coverage in unlisted C1 and C2 water bodies that are up or downstream of listed water bodies.
 - Suggestion to use the Inland Surface Water Plan listing as a baseline for districts developing their water body categorization reports.
- Monitoring/Surveillance
 - Staff provided a summary of San Joaquin River monitoring programs for the case study area.

- Comment that there was monitoring information missing for the San Joaquin East Side Coalition (San Joaquin River @ Vernalis).
- Review of region-wide MUN intakes
 - Staff provided a map of MUN intakes for general review and will be used for the next stakeholder meeting.

Action Items:

- *Central Valley Water Board staff will verify Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program monitoring in the San Joaquin River and update the summary table.*

Discuss Project Schedule and Future Meetings

- Sacramento POTW Basin Plan Amendment
 - State Water Resources Control Board Hearing – tentatively set for August 18, 2015
- Region-wide MUN Process Basin Plan Amendment
 - Basin Plan Amendment Informational Item – July 30/31 (Rancho Cordova) - Focus on LIMITED-MUN
 - Comments on San Luis Canal Company Draft Water Body Categorization Report Due July 3, 2015
 - Next Stakeholder Meeting – Focus on Monitoring/Surveillance, Recirculating Systems – August 2015

Action Items:

- *Anne Littlejohn will send out Meet-o-Matic schedule and Save-the-date emails for the next stakeholder meeting.*
- *Meeting notes will be posted to the website*